REMARKS

The above amendments and following remarks are submitted within the 60 priority period under 37 C.F.R. 1.116 in response to the Final Official Action of the Examiner mailed March 30, 2006. Having addressed all objections and grounds of rejection, claims 1-25, being all the pending claims, are now deemed in condition for allowance. Entry of this amendment and reconsideration to that end is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,810,429, issued to Walsh et al (hereinafter referred to as "Walsh"). This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed for the failure of the rejection to comply with MPEP 2131.

The standards for a finding of anticipation during examination are specified in MPEP 2131, which provides in part:

> TO ANTICIPATE A CLAIM, THE REFERENCE MUST TEACH EVERY ELEMENT OF THE CLAIM
> "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).
> "**The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.**" *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). (emphasis added)

The rejection is respectfully traversed because Walsh does not disclose "the identical invention.....in as complete detail as is contained in the claim[s]".

The most basic differences between Applicants' claimed invention and Walsh are readily apparent. Common to all pending claims, is a user terminal which generates an XML document which is transferred over the claimed network and converted into an incompatible, non-XML format for use by the claimed data base management system.

The system of Walsh is easily distinguishable as shown in Fig. 1b. The user 103, utilizing web browser 124, generates a non-XML message (i.e., HTML 121 or HTTP 122) for transfer to the to front-end interface 120, which converts the user generated message into XML. Subsequent transfers and handling within integration system 100 occur as XML documents (i.e., elements 102 and 106), except for transfers back to user 103 which are converted from XML to HTML or HTTP.

In short, the claimed user terminal communicates in XML which needs conversion for communication with other system elements. The user interface of Walsh is not in XML, so that all outputs of web browser 124 are converted into XML and all transfers to web browser 124 are converted from XML. As a result, a number of the claimed structural elements utilized in the conversion process may be compared with corresponding structures within Walsh. However, the claimed invention converts **from XML** for transfers from the user terminal, and Walsh converts **to XML** for transfers from the user. Similarly, the claimed

invention converts **to XML** for transfers to the user terminal, and Walsh converts **from XML** for transfers to the user.

This distinction was explained to the Examiner in a previous response. In response thereto, the Examiner states:

> The Examiner consider (sic) XML doc. Fig. 1b, item 106, 126, XML document. Col. 9, lines 38-44 and XML format. **Col. 4, lines 17-21, clearly shows the user interface of Walsh is XML**. (Emphasis added)

Though Applicants do not deny that Fig. 1b, items 106 and 126 are XML documents, it is clear from Fig. 1b that these documents are generated in XML by front-end processor 120 rather than user 103 and web browser 124 which communicate only in HTML 121 and HTTP 122.

Thus the emphasized portion of this statement is clearly erroneous and is inconsistent with the explicit teaching of Walsh. Column 3, lines 13-15, states:

> A front-end interface converts the output XML documents to output HTML forms and the input HTML forms to the XML documents.

Apparently, the Examiner agrees with Applicants, because he now makes the incongruous finding that front-end interface 120 is somehow deemed the claimed "user terminal".

That front-end interface 120 is not the claimed "user terminal" should be readily apparent to anyone of skill in the art. Column 7, lines 12-21, states:

> Being Web based, the user 103 can use any standard browser 124 to interact with the system from anywhere there is an Internet access point.

In other words, user 103 communicates via web browser 124 over the Internet to front-end interface 120. It is simply incomprehensible that anyone would seriously consider that front-end processor 120 is the claimed "user terminal".

As further evidence the Examiner may wish to read column 7, lines 18-24, which states:

> The HTTP is used as the communication mechanism between agents and users. The user 103 browses and modifies information, and initiates processes via the web browser 124. User requests are routed to agents 101 via Http and through the Java servlet. The servlet 123 in turn communicates with a front-end service bridge 125 that serves as an interface for the agents 101.

In addition, column 7, lines 35-47, states:

> We accomplish the display of information to users with HTML, web pages, and web forms. As stated above, the information that agents retrieve from data sources is in the form of the XML documents 102. To format the XML documents into a form suitable for users, the front-end servlet 123 converts the XML document into a HTML page using a style sheet 126, e.g.., XSL, JSP or some other data replacement technique as described below. The result of this conversion is the HTML page containing the information in a user-friendly format. By applying the style sheet, the servlet recognizes and replaces certain data from the XML document and converts the data to HTML form.

As a result, the evidence is overwhelming that to the extent Walsh has a "user terminal" as claimed, it consists of user 103 and web browser 124, but does not include front-end interface 120 to which it is coupled via the Internet.

These primary distinctions become most apparent as one considers the differences between the claimed invention and Walsh.

Claim 1, as amended, is limited by:

> **a document** containing a plurality of elements formatted **in XML** (extensible markup language) **generated by said user terminal transferred via said publicly accessible digital data communication network** to said data base management system (emphasis added)

Clearly this element is not found in Walsh. It is the essence of the disclosure of Walsh that user 103, operating through web browser 124 does not generate a document in XML as required by the claim.

In making his rejection, the Examiner alleges that the claimed "document" is Fig. 1b, element 126 which is clearly generated by front-end interface 120 and not by user 103, operating through web browser 124. Even if front-end interface 120 were the claimed "user terminal" as now suggested by the Examiner, it (i.e., front-end interface 124) is not coupled to the claimed "data base management system" via the claimed "publicly accessible digital data communication network".

Thus, Walsh cannot meet this limitation "as contained in the claim" as required by MPEP 2131. The rejection of claim 1, and all claims depending therefrom, is respectfully traversed.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and further limits an element of the claimed "XML mapping tree" by:

> at least one of said plurality of **elements** further comprises an attribute which is recorded within said XML mapping tree (emphasis added)

In accordance with the basic rules of claim construction, the "elements" referred to in claim 2 are the "elements" within the "document" of claim 1, which is generated by the claimed "user terminal". Instead of properly applying the law, the Examiner cites column 10, lines 55-67, of Walsh which describes the contents of DTD 142 (see Fig. 1b). It should be clear to the most casual observer that DTD 142 is **not** the claimed "document" generated by the claimed "user terminal". The rejection of claim 2 is respectfully traversed for failure to meet the requirements of MPEP 2131.

Claim 3 depends from claim 2 and is further limited by transferring the DTD from the "user terminal" to the "data base management system". The Examiner's finding in support of his rejection is clearly erroneous. Walsh states at column 9, lines 52-53:

> As shown in FIG. 2, the primary purpose of the design tools 140 is to generate 141 XML document type definitions (DTD) 142....

The DTD is transferred **to** the browser in Walsh, rather than **from** the user terminal as claimed by Applicants. Surely, the Examiner can appreciate this distinction, because Applicants' approach permits the user to define a format, whereas Walsh requires the

user to comply with a predefined format. The rejection of claim 3 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 4 depends from claim 3 and is further limited by "internal storage of the XML element tree". As has been explained above in detail, the alleged combination has no "XML element tree" as claimed. Therefore, it is not illogical that the alleged combination has no facility for storing that which it does not have. The rejection of claim 4 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 5 depends from claim 4 and is further limited by "wherein said DTD location path is displayed on said user terminal as a window". As if to confuse the matter, the Examiner cites Walsh Fig. 1b, which says nothing of DTD in relation to user 103, nothing of "DTD location path", nothing of "display", nothing of a "window. It is hard to contemplate a citation which would be more irrelevant to the Examiner's rejection and to Applicants' claimed invention. The rejection of claim 5 is respectfully traversed for failure to comply with MPEP 2131.

Claim 6 is an independent apparatus claim having five basic elements. Walsh has none of these elements, because the claim requires the generation of these elements to be performed by the user terminal. Though the Examiner's rejection is vague in this regard, it is clear as explained above that front-end interface 120 cannot be the claimed "user terminal".

Walsh has no need for the claimed "XML mapping tree", because Walsh supplies the format of the XML messages to the user in the form of a DTD. Unlike Applicants' system, the users of Walsh are not free to define their own formats, but must instead utilize the DTD's generated by Design Tools 140 (see Walsh Figs. 1b and 2). The rejection of claim 6, and all claims depending therefrom, is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 depends from claim 6 and further limits the claimed "XML mapping tree". Walsh has no "XML mapping tree" for the reasons explained above. Therefore, it has no such further limitations of the claimed "XML mapping tree". Therefore, the Examiner summarily cites Fig. 1b which says nothing of the claimed limitations and certainly does not show "the identical invention in as complete detail as the claimed invention". The rejection of claim 7 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 8 depends from claim 7 and further limits the claimed "XML document" generated by the claimed "user terminal". As explained above, the Walsh does not have an "XML document" generated by the claimed "user terminal". Furthermore, Walsh does not have the limitations of claim 7 from which claim 8 depends. Therefore, Walsh cannot have the further limitations of claim 8. The rejection of claim 8 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 9 depends from claim 8 and further limits the claimed "XML mapping tree". Walsh has no "XML mapping tree" for the reasons explained above. Therefore, it has no such further

limitations of the claimed "XML mapping tree". The rejection of claim 9 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 10 depends from claim 9 and further limits the claimed "publicly accessible digital data communication network". As explained above, Walsh does not have the limitations of claim 9 from which claim 10 depends. Therefore, Walsh cannot have the further limitations of claim 10. The rejection of claim 10 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 11 is an independent claim for:

> a method of interfacing an XML document **from a user terminal** to a data base management system having an incompatible input protocol (emphasis added)

The Examiner simply ignores the emphasized portion of the claim. It has three basic steps. Because Walsh does not have "an XML document **from a user terminal**", it does not have any of these steps. However, it is most apparent that the second and third steps, in particular, are not found in the prior art of record, because Walsh has no need of a source mapping tree. As explained in detail above, Walsh performs conversions in a different manner, because Walsh supplies the DTD to the users, rather than permitting the users to determine their own formats. The rejection of claim 11, and all claims depending therefrom, is respectfully traversed.

Claim 12 depends from claim 11 and further limits the handling of the claimed "XML mapping tree". As explained in

detail above, Walsh does not have and does not need the claimed "XML mapping tree". Therefore, the alleged combination cannot have the further limitations of claim 12. The rejection of claim 12 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 13 depends from claim 12 and further limits the handling of the claimed "XML mapping tree". As explained in detail above, Walsh does not have and does not need the claimed "XML mapping tree". Therefore, Walsh cannot have the further limitations of claim 13. Furthermore, claim 13, along with claims 15 and 18, appear to have rejections somehow dependent upon the disclosure of Cheng. The rejection of claim 13 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 14 depends from claim 13 and further limits the claimed "XML document". As explained above, Walsh does not have the limitations of claim 13 from which claim 14 depends. Therefore, Walsh cannot have the further limitations of claim 14. The rejection of claim 14 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 15 depends from claim 14 and further limits the claimed "publicly accessible digital data communication network". As explained above, Walsh does not have the limitations of claim 14 from which claim 15 depends. Therefore, Walsh cannot have the further limitations of claim 15. The rejection of claim 15 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 16 is an independent apparatus claim having "means-plus-function" limitations. Though Walsh has none of the four

basic elements, it is most apparent that it does not have the "composing means", because Walsh does not have the claimed "XML mapping tree". The rejection of claim 16, and all claims depending therefrom, is respectfully traversed.

Claim 17 depends from claim 16 and further limits the claimed "composing means". As explained above, Walsh does not have the limitations of claim 16 from which claim 17 depends. Therefore, Walsh cannot have the further limitations of claim 17. The rejection of claim 17 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 18 depends from claim 17 and further limits the claimed "XML document". As explained above, Walsh does not have the limitations of claim 17 from which claim 18 depends. Therefore, it cannot have the further limitations of claim 18. The rejection of claim 18 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 19 depends from claim 18 and further limits the claimed "transmitting means". As explained above, Walsh does not have the limitations of claim 18 from which claim 19 depends. Therefore, Walsh cannot have the further limitations of claim 19. The rejection of claim 19 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 20 depends from claim 19 and is further limited by the claimed "displaying means". As explained above, Walsh does not have the limitations of claim 19 from which claim 20 depends. Therefore, Walsh cannot have the further limitations of claim 20. The rejection of claim 20 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 21 is an independent apparatus claim. Of the four major claim elements, it is most apparent that the fourth element (i.e., "XML mapping tree") is simply not found in Walsh. As explained above, Walsh does not have this claimed element, because it is not needed. The rejection of claim 21, and all claims depending therefrom, is respectfully traversed.

Claim 22 depends from claim 21 and is further limited in that the DTD is transferred **from** the user terminal **to** the claimed legacy data base management system. As explained above, anyone viewing Figs. 1b and 2 of Walsh readily understands that the DTD of Walsh is generated by Design Tools 140 and transferred to browser 124. To the extent that the Examiner reads Walsh differently, his findings are clearly erroneous. The rejection of claim 22 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 23 depends from claim 22 and is further limited by a "repository" which stores the claimed "XML mapping tree". Walsh does not have the claimed "repository", because Walsh does not have the claimed "XML mapping tree". The rejection of claim 23 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 24 depends from claim 23 and is further limited by "a window for display of the DTD on the user terminal". Walsh does not show "windows" for any purpose. Furthermore, as if to confuse the matter, the Examiner cites a great deal of the disclosure of Walsh (i.e., Figs. 1a, 2, and 4, along with column 9, line 57, through column 16, line 67), which says nothing of

the claimed "window". The rejection of claim 24 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 25 depends from claim 24 and further limits the claimed "publicly accessible digital data communication network". As explained above, Walsh does not have the limitations of claim 24 from which claim 25 depends. Therefore, Walsh cannot have the further limitations of claim 25. The rejection of claim 25 is respectfully traversed.

Having thus responded to each objection and ground of rejection, Applicants respectfully request entry of this amendment and allowance of claims 1-25, being the only pending claims.

Please charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 14-0620.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas N. Turba

By his attorney,

Date May 30, 2006

Wayne A. Sivertson
Reg. No. 25,645
Suite 401
Broadway Place East
3433 Broadway Street N.E.
Minneapolis, MN 55413
(612) 331-1464